



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,083	07/23/2007	Dirk Lappe	11336.1235 (P01040US)	9650
7590 06/05/2009 Brinks Hofer Gilson & Lione P O Box 10395 Chicago, IL 60610				
EXAMINER				
LI, CE LI				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3661				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/05/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/562,083

**Applicant(s)**

LAPPE ET AL.

**Examiner**

CE LI

**Art Unit**

3661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 March 2009.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-11 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 December 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04/29/2009  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1, 5-6, and 12-13 have been amended. Claims 9-11 are cancelled. Claims 1-8 and 12-21 are pending.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed 03/02/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues on page 2 of the Remarks with respect to claims 1-8 and 12, "the combination of Ohler, Saiki, and Bates does not disclose the criteria as in claims 1-8, and 12. in particular, the combination does not disclose the notifications of the devices for violations of the criteria". In response to applicant's argument that Ohler discloses criteria and meeting place violates the criteria in Col. 5, and in Col. 13, he discloses indication to notify user when the desired meeting time is too soon, also it does not preclude when there is not violation in criteria. In response to applicant's argument with respect to claim 12 on quality of identified rendezvous point, Saiki does disclose taking the quality of rendezvous point, such as parking lot availability, into determining the rendezvous in Col. 2 and 5. In response to applicant's argument with respect to claims 13-21 on approval of a rendezvous position or the recalculation when the rendezvous position is not approved, Saiki does disclose approval of a rendezvous position or the recalculation when the rendezvous position is not approved in Col. 9 and 10, and Figure 4.

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8, and 12-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant adds new limitations to claims 1 and 13, therefore, the amendment changes the scope of the claims and new ground of rejection is necessitated.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-3, 5, and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Ohler et al. (US 6,424,910).

Ohler discloses a method coordinating routes of a plurality of navigation devices comprising:

As to claim 1, receiving a first set of data by a first navigation device (col. 10, lines 8-10), the first set of data including first criteria for selecting a rendezvous position (Col. 12, lines 44-67); receiving a second set of data from a second navigation device by the first navigation device (col. 11, lines 19-20), the second set of data including data representing a current position of the second navigation device, and second criteria for selecting a rendezvous position (Col. 12, lines 44-67); identifying a rendezvous position based on the first criteria and the second criteria, where the rendezvous position is used for establishing a first route for the first navigation device to the rendezvous position and

for establishing a second route for the second navigation device to the rendezvous position (Figures 2-4); notifying the first navigation device when the identified rendezvous position and the first route violated the first criteria; and notifying the second navigation device when the identified rendezvous position and the second route violates the second criteria. (Col. 13, lines 1-8)

As to claim 2, further comprising transmitting a third set of data from the first navigation device to the second navigation device, the third set of data representing at least a portion of the calculated first positional data (col. 11, lines 30-36).

As to claim 3, further comprising transmitting a request signal from the first navigation device to the second navigation device to initiate transmission of the second set of data (col. 11, lines 16-17).

As to claim 5, where the first criteria and the second criteria comprise a a minimum travel distance, a minimum time, use/avoidance of certain roads/freeways/bridges/tunnels, or intermediate destinations (Col. 3, lines 48-57)

***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
7. Claims 4, 6-8, 12-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohler et al. (US 6,424,910) in view of Saiki (US 7,058,507).

Ohler discloses a navigation devices comprising:

As to claim 13, a first receiving section configured to receive and decode a first signal indicating a current position of the navigation device (col. 10, lines 8-10); a second receiving section configured to receive and decode a confirmation signal for communication with an external device (Figure 5); a request signal requesting communication with an external device and external positional data via a communications network (col. 11, lines 16-17); a calculation unit configured to calculate, upon receipt of the confirmation signal by the second receiving section, a rendezvous position for the first navigation device and the external device based on first signal and the external position data (Figures 3-4)

As to claim 14, where the second receiving section and the transmission section each comprise an interface for wireless communication (col. 2, lines 58-61) with external devices according to a specified data communications standard.

As to claim 15, where the second receiving section and the transmission section each comprise an interface to a mobile phone (col. 2, lines 58-61).

As to claim 16, where the second receiving section and the transmission section comprise a high frequency demodulator and a high frequency modulator (col. 2, lines

58-61), respectively, so as to receive the confirmation signal and transmit the request signal, respectively.

As to claim 17, where the calculation unit is configured to calculate the positional data on the basis of geographical data representing a road map (col. 3, lines 18-36)

Ohler does not explicitly disclose sending rendezvous position for approval. But Saiki discloses sending rendezvous position for approval.

Saiki discloses:

As to claim 13, a calculation unit configured to calculate, upon receipt of the confirmation signal by the second receiving section, a rendezvous position for the first navigation device and the external device based on first signal and the external position data (Figure 3), where the rendezvous position is provided to the navigation device for approval (Figure 4); and a transmission section configured to encode the rendezvous position in an output signal transmitted via the communications network to the external device when the rendezvous position is approved (Figure 4); where the rendezvous position is recalculated when the rendezvous position is not approved (figure 4).

As to claim 4, comprising transmitting a confirmation signal by the second navigation device to acknowledge data communication with the first navigation device (Figures 3-4).

As to claim 6, calculating second positional data in the second navigation device on the basis of the current position of the second navigation device and the third set of data (col. 10, lines 13-16);

As to claim 7, where the first positional data and the second positional data are calculated on the basis of an estimated average speed of the first navigation device and the second navigation device (col. 1, lines 20-23, col. 6, lines 61-62);

As to claim 8, receiving an updated version of the second set of data and calculating the first positional data on the basis of the updated second set of data (col. 11, lines 8-28);

As to claim 12, further comprising receiving further information regarding the identified rendezvous point based on prior identification of the identified rendezvous point, where the further information comprises a quality of the identified rendezvous point (Col. 2, lines 38-53)

As to claim 18, Saiki discloses a user interface configured to report the receipt of the meeting place signal to a user, and to initiate the transmission of the selected meeting place upon user request instead of report the receipt of request signal and initiate transmission of conformation signal. Since Saiki's user interface can report the receipt of the meeting place signal to a user, and to initiate the transmission of the selected meeting place upon user request, it should also be able to report the receipt of request signal and initiate transmission of conformation signal (Figure 4);

As to claim 19, a host unit (Figure 6) configured to receive positional data from the first and the second navigation devices (Figure 6), calculate first and second proposed positional data for the first and second navigation devices (Figure 5), and to communicate the first proposed positional data to the first navigation device and the



second proposed positional data to the second navigation device to coordinate a route of the first and second navigation devices (Col. 12, lines 1-19).

As to claim 20, where the host unit is implemented in at least one of the first or the second navigation device and where at least one of the first or second navigation device comprising the host unit further includes an activation means to activate the host unit upon user request (Col. 4, lines 29-50).

As to claim 21, where the host unit is connected to a network service provider (Ohler, Figure 1).

Therefore, given the teaching of Saiki, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying the navigation device of Ohler by employing the well known or conventional features of sending rendezvous position for approval. But Saiki discloses sending rendezvous position for approval, as disclosed by Saiki, in order to select a meeting place suitable and convenient to all users and update the meeting place with respect to current traffic jams and other conditions.

#### **Prior Art Made of Record**

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Banks et al. (US 6975873) discloses a method for notifying users that calculated location is not in compliance with the criteria.
- b. Klein (US 2002/0004700) discloses a method for changing routes or destinations due to traffic problem.

***Conclusion***

1. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CE LI whose telephone number is (571)270-5564. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 9AM-5PM, EST, every other Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black can be reached on (571)272-6956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CE LI/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3661

/Thomas G. Black/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3661